DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 975 CG 003 127

By-Konietzko, Kurt

A Theorectical Frame of Reference for Rational-Emotive Psychotherapy and Its Application to the Problems of the Under-Achiever.

American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C.

Pub Date Apr 68

Note-26p.; Speech presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Detroit, Michigan, April 7-11, 1968.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.40

Descriptors-Emotional Experience, *Emotional Problems, Environmental Influences, Perception, Psychological Characteristics, *Psychotherapy, Self Actualization, Self Esteem, *Self Evaluation, Underachievers

The Rational Emotive Approach centers upon a model in which the human being is seen as a series of systems constantly interacting with others to keep itself functioning. Underlying this approach is the view that it is never the event, but our view of it, which creates the emotional response. Many irrational, culturally structured beliefs cause emotional upsets, including one's perceptions of approval, competence, blame, dependence, emotion, and authority. The concept of externalization is the root of many difficulties. Rational Emotive Therapy, as appropriate for children as it is for adults, attempts to confront the client with his basic irrational assumptions. It seeks to make him understand that it is his evaluations which create his emotional upsets, and seeks to get him to challenge his internalized thoughts and implement the necessary corrections. The therapeutic goal is a self-actualized human being capable of living in an intelligent, self-satisfying way, socially concerned and creatively involved. (KP)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A THEORETICAL FRAME OF REFERENCE FOR RATIONAL-EMOTIVE PSYCHOTHERAPY AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE UNDER-ACHIEVER

By

Kurt Konietzko, Ph D.

ED024975

Paper presented at The American Personnel and Guidance Association's Annual Convention at Detroit, April 9, 1968 at the panel on "New Counseling Approaches with the Under-Achiever in Higher Education."

CG 003 127

ED024975

Kurt Konietzko
Pre-Publication Copy

A THEORETICAL FRAME OF REFERENCE FOR RATIONAL-EMOTIVE PSYCHOTHERAPY AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE UNDER-ACHIEVER

The basic model for the Rational Emotive approach to counseling and psychotherapy which I have found particularly useful is a Cybernetic-Communications Model. This model, which I will briefly present for your consideration, has many features which particularly appeal to me but may, of course, not appeal to you.

I visualize this model as being flexible, adaptable, and not at variance with the basic knowledge in any of the sciences. It is a self-corrective model which sees the human being as consisting of a series of systems constantly interacting with one another and thus keeping the human being or organism functioning. For example, the human organism has a circulatory system, a skeletal system, a muscular system, an autonomic nervous system, an endocrine system, etc. The human being also has regulatory mechanisms which allow him to maintain a homeostatic state of existence so that critical balances can be maintained. I refer here to such things as acid level, oxygen content, temperature control, etc. Any and all of these and other systems can, of course, malfunction to produce disease or bizarre responses or conditions. The human body is so organized as to consist of organs, each of which has a specific function: the heart,

to circulate the blood with its nutrient and oxygen content so that all the body's cells are supplied; the lungs, to exchange oxygen for carbon dioxide. All organ systems have definite functions.

The nervous system also has specific functions. Part of this system is the cortex which can be said to have such specific functions just as the heart, the lungs, etc. have. The cortex has the function of storing and analyzing information and directing specific responses or adjustment maneuvers if indicated. Some movements are reflexive in nature, like the movement of one's foot away from an unknown or painful stimuli. Others are goal directed and coordinated by the cortex. These can be deliberately guided movements or well-habituated movements which occur almost automatically. I refer, of course, to movements such as those used in walking, driving, etc., which originally may have required a great deal of attention and concentration, but which now require little effort and only general guiding by the cortex.

In the main, the function of the cortex is to help maintain the organism's survival and to allow it to get from the outer environment what it needs for its internal environment. As a result, it exhibits goal-directed behavior which is, to a large degree, dependent on feedback from receptors. These allow correction of behavior and greater effectiveness. If the basic message is "I am hungry", food seeking behavior will be

initiated unless the person gives himself a counter message, such as, "I am on a diet and will skip lunch". Even here he may drink water in the hope of eliminating the hunger pangs. I hope that the above very brief description allows you to think of yourself as a series of systems.

The various sciences furnish information or data on the operation of the human being in interaction with his environment. The study of physiology, biology, biochemistry, anatomy, neurology, etc., will provide theoretical and factual information concerning the operation of the various systems and how different processes within them take place: for instance, how proteins are synthesized, how digestive processes actually work, how nerve impulses are transmitted, etc. Basic to these studies are, of course, the laws of physics and chemistry.

However, if one is interested in how the organism learns, then one can specifically go to psychology and learning theory to understand why and how the human organism behaves the way it does.

If one is interested in the content of the information that is stored, the sciences of sociology and anthropology will give pertinent data to help explain what information is available for the organism to learn. It specifies the transmitters of the cultural values of society and helps to indicate the flexibility and adaptability of the human being to many beliefs and mores.

If one is interested in man's philosophies or the guiding belief systems and values by which he judges his own performance

and that of others, one can look at philosophy, which in a broad sense includes religion.

Since man is a verbal animal and since language is one of the major characteristics that distinguishes man from animal, one can utilize general semantics to see what errors arise by the way man uses language or, using a psycho-linguistic approach, determine what, if any, universals exist in language.

One can consult with archeology to ferret out the past of mankind and with history to observe the human being in a developmental sense. From the preceding, you can see that the model is basically a scientific one which attempts to include information from all the sciences to answer questions about man, about you and I.

Underlying the Rational Emotive approach there is a major hypothesis or assumption. It was, in fact, stated by the stoic philosophers such as Epictetus and some of the mystics. It has been and is being scientifically validated by Magda Arnold in her neurological investigations, and by experiments being done on brain stimulation. The approach is old, yet revolutionary! The basic view is that it is never the event itself, but our view of it which creates the emotional response. This basic concept has many interesting and far reaching implications. If one's view of a situation determines one's emotional response to it, and if sustained

emotional reactions are the result of cortical evaluations which in order to be sustained must, in fact, be constantly reiterated, then the responsibility for the emotional response and the ability to control or terminate it also lies within the individual human being. In other words, the major irrational idea that other people are responsible for your happiness and/or unhappiness is false. If you believe that others are responsible for your emotional reactions or your unhappiness and misery, you will then blame them for treating you in a way you do not like. Thus you hold them responsible for your reactions and wait for them to change before you have any possibility of attaining happiness. Do you really need other people to be happy or unhappy??? Of course not!! All you need to be unhappy is your own neurological system and a series of ideas and thoughts which you keep repeating to yourself such as "life is hopeless", "I have and never will amount to anything", "this is awful, terrible, -- oh, poor me!! If you repeat this type of thought-sequence often enough you will in fact experience the symptoms and emotional reactions of depression. If, on the other hand, you are interested in producing in yourself the emotion of anger, you can simply repeat the assertion that "he or she or it -- something out there, shouldn't have done whatever they did. By constantly dwelling on this and reiterating how terrible it is -- how dirty a

trick it is, and how unfair it is, you get angrier and angrier.

When, in fact, was the last time you were angry? Was it while you were driving the car, when you were getting ready to go to work, or was it on the way home? I'm sure you can recall an incident when no one was with you, or you were "lost in your own thoughts". What was actually happening at that moment?

You were thinking about what had happened and how wrong and unfair it was to have occurred. Somebody down at the office said something about those peculiar ties you wear. When your wife said something about them you got a little teed off but then you both laughed about the whole thing. Now the whole tie affair has become an office joke. You stew to yourself, "He had no right to start those remarks. He should not have said what he did." Ah, but he had every right to say anything he wanted to say, short of slander. (Freedom of speech--remember?) And what he did--did it really hurt you? No, you're still the same person with the same ridiculous ties. The only possible difference is that now people may suspect that you really can't take a joke. This you can try to change or you can give yourself a pain in the neck worrying about.

Last week you were angry again. Wednesday at 4:30 the boss asked you to contact an old client before you left. You got involved and forgot to call Mary, your wife. On the

way home from the appointment you cursed every red light that made you later. When you finally got home Mary blew up because you were more than an hour late and her surprise souffle was ruined. And the evening was ruined because, as you think about it now, Mary blew up. Every day this week you've smoldered just thinking about her absolutely ridiculous behavior.

With all these annoyances in your life is it any wonder you yelled at the kids for not cleaning up the yard after school yesterday?? Then when your oldest, almost 17, yelled back at you that was too much. You really slapped him good, across the face, too. You'd certainly think by the time a kid got to be 17 he would learn to control his temper, wouldn't you??

These emotional reactions are, unfortunately, quite familiar to all of us. They clearly represent how upset we can get without anyone else's help. In fact we are experts at disturbing ourselves.

Now let me briefly cover some of the irrational ideas we have together with their causes.

As a child it is natural for us to be dependent. Our period of dependency lasts a good fifteen years and frequently more than twenty. We become conditioned to such secondary behavior reinforcers as approval because we like the smile,

pat on the head, words of praise, etc., and we become fearful of disapproval because this is shown the child by punishment of one sort or another. We may begin to think that if we do not receive approval or someone doesn't like us, that it is terrible, horrible, or awful. Since we have known the consequences of disapproval in terms of punishment we become afraid of disapproval. To be concerned about these matters is sensible, realistic, and intelligent. However, to become truly fearful, anxious, or upset about it is irrational. If as adults we cannot recognize that our position in life is not the same as it was when we were children we will invariably be needlessly upset or unhappy. Since we associate being loved with being "good" or worthwhile, we too often conclude that we are *no* good unless we are loved or approved of. As a popular song puts it, "You're nobody 'til somebody loves you, you're nobody 'til somebody cares."

It is natural for us as children then to be concerned about getting approval, being liked or loved. It could even be said in the early years that physical contact and affectionate handling are essential to life. But we are conditioned to believe this, to see ourselves as needing love and affection--a need being defined as essential to life or happiness. Hence, our worth becomes externalized. It is an internalization of other people's attitudes and beliefs about us. Since as children we have no control over the techniques or emotional

stability of our parents, we may have to live with parents who are overly concerned with gaining popularity or conforming to other people's standards. As a result we ourselves become overly concerned about approval.

This, of course, is nothing new but are the implications clear to you? If you believe that you must be loved, approved of, or thought to be a great fellow by virtually every human being you come into contact with or that has any significance for you whatsoever - then you are going to expend so much energy running around getting other people's approval that you will seldom have time to do the things that you might like to do. Hence you will feel deprived and abused. You will also find that others will not reciprocate in kind and you will at times then become hostile or depressed. You will frequently think that people are a bunch of bums. Incidentally, every society fosters this kind of belief because the desire for other people's good will, approval and/or good wishes is the greatest control on human behavior society can, in fact, have.

Another irrational concept which we have been trained to believe without question is that we should be thoroughly competent, adequate, and achieving individuals in almost everything we do. In other words, we should be good in many things, even outstanding or perfect if at all possible. If we are not A or B students then we feel we are doing poorly.

A low grade indicates our propensity for failure. Should we accept a D grade casually and not be really gung ho on achieving we are viewed as worthless individuals for whom there is, in all probability, no hope.

We get approval for achieving, we get praise for achieving, and generally we get condemnation and disapproval for not achieving as well as our standards or someone else's say we should. Our worth becomes conditional because we tie our self-concept, our worth as a human being, to an external situation.

If I achieve, if I do everything well, if I am perfect, if I get that A, if I get that promotion, if I get that salary increase or that title, if I have a big house, or two cars--whatever our definition of worth may be--if I have these things then I am worthwhile, and if I do not, then I am not worthwhile. The externalization of worth is a pernicious concept but, for society, it is quite useful. It motivates us to work hard, and long, and to achieve mightily. And, of course, our society rewards behavior of this kind.

Another illogical attitude in our society is the philosophy of blame. This consists of the idea that people who differ from us in work or belief are wrong, wicked, bad, and should be blamed and ostracized. Their humanness and worth is denigrated, and punishment is administered whenever possible to "straighten them out." Unfortunately, this

attitude is not particularly helpful since it only increases the other problems the disturbed human being already has.

We will discuss this philosophy of blame in more detail later on. It, of course, is involved in any situation where we are frustrated or where we believe that other people cause our unhappiness, since we usually blame them for being such miserable S.O.B.'s. The more we blame others, the angrier we get which frequently makes us less capable and hence, more blaming--a vicious cycle!

Another belief many of us hold is that our emotional responses will magically produce results. We seem to feel that if we get mad enough, other people will respond by taking away our frustrations. It seems as if we were operating under instructions which say when things do not go right, we should get upset - that it is awful if things aren't going our way and that the most appropriate response is to get upset. It may, of course, seem such a natural thing to do (so well habituated) that we never question the appropriateness of our response or if we do, our ability to change it. As you well know, under emotional stress, our ability to think logically and productively, to analyze accurately and to make decisions is grossly impaired. We develop tunnel vision, or "lockjaw of the brain." If we follow this pattern we will in general, operate ineffectually.

Yet there are millions of people who do operate this way. Consider the worrier who acts as if he believes that if something bad, unfortunate or dangerous <u>might</u> occur, he should constantly dwell on it and emotionally disturb himself further? This is irrational behavior which the worrier seems to think will magically change reality. He appears to believe that if he worries it means he cares which is obviously an irrational way of demonstrating one's concern. This idea, that we can magically change or control our environment by our emotional responses was, no doubt, learned in childhood. When we were upset, or unhappy, our parents may have become solicitous, inquiring as to why we were unhappy. They may have tried to alleviate our suffering or give us what we wanted. We, of course, may have seen the same pattern in our parents who also got upset in an attempt to influence or control each other. If we tracked dirt into the house, mother probably screamed. If mother spent too much on a new hat, father became angry. If father was late for dinner, mother may have become hysterical. These were all attempts at controlling other members of the household which of course, usually failed. Each person repeated the same behavior and then, of course, the irrational emotional response was repeated---proving this to be a futile method of control.

Another frequently held attitude which creates problems for human beings is the attitude that it is easier to avoid life's difficulties and responsibilities than to face them. If you believe this, you will be in trouble because avoidance doesn't solve problems, and we have a tendency to blame ourselves for avoiding difficult situations--for not getting our problems resolved. This behavior may provide us with short range relief but in the long run, it causes unhappiness. In addition, we frequently spend a lot of time debating whether or not to avoid a particular problem and torturing ourselves with our ambivalence. We also do not increase our self confidence by avoiding difficult tasks. Usually underneath this avoidance behavior there are irrational sentences which the person is repeating to himself, for example:

"Life is supposed to be easy, or I am entitled to have things now because of how I've suffered in the past," or I shouldn't have to do these things." This attitude is found frequently in unsuccessful therapy cases.

Another attitude frequently held by people states that one shouldn't be completely independent, that one needs someone who cares, someone stronger than oneself. This attitude, which forces dependency, feelings of inadequacy, and greater insecurity, along with decreased self confidence, is hardly a rational approach. Some people may have to be dependent,

sometimes excessively so, on others because of their actual inadequacies and their actual and realistic inability to function independently. For many people, however, this view is really irrational. It is possible to work alone on a project and to be happy and content. It is also possible to live alone and be happy. If one is married, he or she does not need to lean excessively on his spouse for emotional support. Even a marriage relationship can, and in fact, should allow the partners to be individuals. Complete dependence and absorption may at first be intensely pleasurable but later on it usually becomes disappointing and stiffling.

Another irrational theory sometimes held is occasionally seen in people who are chronically down, chronically worried, and chronically bouncing from one therapeutic agency to another. They are usually firm believers in their own self-analysis which is "I come from a poor background; I have done evil, bad, or wicked things and I am a bad, worthless human being--therefore, I cannot change; I am a hopeless case!" This attitude is the result of the belief that the past is all-important and will affect one's life indefinitely. Therefore, one cannot do anything to change or modify his own behavior. This, of course, is an over-generalization and results in not looking for an alternative solution. It is frequently present in unsuccessful therapy cases.

Another irrational concept is that one should get upset over other people's problems and disturbances. Again there is the belief that almost magically things will change if one gets upset. It is constantly necessary to remind oneself that the emotional response is, in fact, ineffectual and irrelevant. Actually people have little power over others and certainly there are better ways of inducing other people to change than by becoming emotionally upset over them or their behavior.

Another irrational concept that man frets over from early childhood is that the names he is called will harm him. Children chant the rhyme "sticks and stones can break my bones, but names will never hurt me," from a very young age on yet how many of us really believe that words can't hurt us? This sensitivity to words, these rules and how and what kind of words another person should use when communicating with us is one of the greatest stumbling blocks to effective communication and good interpersonal relationships. The idea that words can hurt us is obviously absurd unless you continue the childish chant by saying, "names will never hurt me unless it's the words I tell myself."

The irrationality of the perfectionist poses another problem. People who exhibit this characteristic frequently feel that there must be one perfect solution to life's

problems or to human problems and that if they do not find this solution it is so terrible that they should sit and do nothing. Also, the perfectionist sets such high standards for himself that in order to keep from failing he must of necessity never attempt anything since there is naturally always some deviation from perfection in every accomplishment. This crippling attitude usually results from a demand for certainty and control, and is grossly unrealistic since we live in a world of probability and chance. There is no single solution to any of life's problems. People who have this attitude have really been trained to be ineffectual, frustrated and defeated.

Another belief which frequently interferes with one's ability to function adequately is the concept that what someone, whom we considered an authority in the past or in the present, tells us must invariably be correct and we have no right to ever challenge the authority. This attitude then keeps us from questioning our own internalized attitudes and makes it impossible for us to challenge or to change. This is the reason why whole families, adults and their parents and grandparents always vote Republican or why three generations of women use the same washing powder. A recent TV commercial extoling the virtues of Lemon Oil in a furniture wax uses this belief. It shows a mother watching her married daughter polish furniture with a new product.

She is saying, "But I always told you to use Lemon Oil for your furniture." Then the daughter says, "But, mother, this product contains Lemon Oil. See, read the label." The commercial ends with mother's authoritarian image still intact. If a doctor, lawyer, judge or other authoritarian figure expounds on any subject including his own area of expertese--many people feel his opinion is infallible. It may, however, be completely in error.

As we look at these and other problems that human beings may have, such as the tendency to over-generalize, to dichotomize one's universe into rightness and wrongness or better and poor, one becomes increasingly aware of how much the culture structures one's perceptions, and how, by definition, it creates our problems.

If you have been following closely I think you realize that in order to solve our problems effectively we must understand the very cultural conditioning things which keep us from solving our problems whether they are our own personal problems or our social or international problems. It might be said that the society and the individual are part of a transaction or interchange. When the individual is growing up the society structures for him and transmits to him the assumptions of his culture (the attitudes, values, and beliefs) which are held to be correct and proper. The individual so programmed then continues to perpetuate the status quo, accepting beliefs which may be irrational and harmful to him.

Let us now summarize to some extent what we have been saying concerning these irrational concepts and ideas and see whether we cannot, in fact, simplify things for ourselves by working on the major dimensions which appear to be present. As I have previously indicated, the concept of externalization (worth and happiness) is the root of much of our difficulty. For instance, we say that we are worthwhile only if we have money, if we have status, if we have an education, if we have this or that. It is a conditional worth. I will submit to you at this point that one of the things that is most pernicious for human existence if it is to be happy is the concept of human worth. This we must declare by a definition irrelevent to the human condition. We must discriminate between the human's behavior and his "being" or his "humanness"-- so that we may in fact approve or disapprove of his behavior in any one instance but there must be acceptance of the human being as he is and not as we demand that he should be. This itself is a radical, philosophical, attitudinal change for most people and is certainly not something which is superficial. In addition, we have to recognize that we learn to externalize in childhood and are probably biologically predisposed to do so. We recognize that in our society there usually is no physical threat from outside most of our lives and when such a threat occurs we tend to respond to it immediately. For most of our lives we have to realize that we ourselves create

our own problems by our interpretation of events and what we say to ourselves about these events. So you have the concept of externalization both in terms of human worth and as a source of our happiness and unhappiness as being one major source of our personal unhappiness.

The next major variable is the fact that we are a biologically self-centered, self-gratifying, pleasure-seeking organism. We will always be this and we had better recognize it. Those philosophies which teach that one should be self-less have never really been successful in getting people to be, in fact, selfless--or not selfish. Unfortunately, these philosophies usually fail in their attempt to distinguish between the concept of the "selfless person" and the selfish person. The selfless person is one who sees through the sham of his own desires and the creation of his own difficulties by his desires, wants, and assertions, (the "I" process or "self" illusion.) People like this are exceedingly rare and are either extreme relativists or mystics of considerable competency. The fact is that we as a self-centered, self-gratifying, pleasure-seeking animal will frequently, if not most of the time, think of ourselves first. We will often become frustrated and hostile when we are not gratified. This is, of course, the frustration and aggression hypothesis which <u>need</u> not be of major import if we, in fact, erase from our minds the idea that it is terrible to be frustrated, that we cannot

stand being frustrated and that because of our pain, we should blame, punish, or castigate those who gave us this pain by not giving us what we wanted. In other words, if we give up our own grandiose view of life which says that when we want things we want them now, and it is terrible if we don't get them now, we will largely invalidate this hypothesis in our personal lives. A natural consequence of our grandiosity is the view which says the universe exists solely for my gratification.

The third major dimension is our illogical, unrealistic or magical thinking such as when we believe that there is magical power in emotions, that our feelings are terribly important and precede our thoughts. When we see man as being split between his intellect or mind and his body or soma, or do not recognize the difference between a symbol and reality, we are exhibiting this type of behavior. When we superstititiously go through agitated behavior in the hope of magically influencing events or people, our actions are obviously irrational.

As you can see, these major dimensions include practically all of the irrational ideas that Ellis has mentioned and logically analyzed. But it seems to me that underlying all of this is one basic primary principle, namely the principle of reality. If we can see why we are depressed, why we are hostile and angry, why we are

disappointed, etc., we will invariably find that there exists a discrepancy between what we want or believe and what we get or exists, and it is this basic reluctance to accept reality as it exists which is causing our problems. The acceptance of reality, of ourselves, of the world as it exists, is the mentally healthy attitude. This does not mean that one sits on one's rear and does nothing about those things which need to be changed in order to make the world a better place in which to live; nor does it mean that one has to be upset to be motivated to change things. A quiet, determined commitment to work at something with realistic expectations of the degree of probable success gives one endurance for the long pull ahead.

Now let us see how the concepts we have discussed would be applied to the case of an underachiever. The client was an eight year old girl whose mother had remarried about a year before the girl's first visit. The presenting problem was failure in school during the last 7 months, apparently due to depression, or "sadness". The girl was seen ten times, 7 times alone, initially partially with her mother; and twice with her brother, 18 months her junior, and her mother. She was subsequently seen for one visit a number of months later at the request of her father who had entered therapy at that time. His wife also joined him some time later for marital counseling.

The girl was shy initially but answered questions quietly and at the time hesitantly. During the first three sessions it was established that she was a) sad; b) daydreamed a lot in school; c) paid little attention to what was going on in class or to the assignments given by the teacher; d) did not enjoy being sad; e) was not doing well in school; f) she had done well in school before the 7 month period.

She felt sad because her mother had remarried and she missed her real father to whom she felt she had to demonstrate her loyalty. It was pointed out to her during the sessions as these facts came to light that if her father loved her, as she said he did, 1) he would want her to be happy, and 2) if he wanted her to be unhappy and wanted her to grieve for him maybe he had a problem and probably didn't love her the way a father usually loves a child, and 3) even if he did want her to, she was only making herself needlessly unhappy by remaining sad and unhappy since her unhappiness wasn't going to change things anyway. That her Father and Mother had been divorced; that her Mother had remarried; and that she would get a lot more out of life if she accepted these facts and tried to develop a good relationship with her stepfather who also had problems but apparently meant well. Her problems with her brother were brought up and discussed with her and her brother. The jealousy that existed was

brought to light and explored and to some extent, alleviated.

Her school problems seem to have been resolved. The family still has to wrok on many problems, especially the parents who are basically just now confronting each other after four year's of marriage and at present 11 sessions with the husband and three with the wife. I had seen the husband over a year ago when he had left his wife to pursue a homosexual affair. He subsequently resumed living with his wife and may or may not succeed in working out his problems; at this point it is touch and go.

Rational Emotive Therapy attempts a) to confront the client with his basic irrational assumptions, b) to understand that it is his own thoughts, or evaluations that create his upsets; c) to get him to challenge his internalized sentences, self talk, thoughts, etc., and to implement whatever corrections are necessary to alleviate or correct the problems.

The author is presently seeing a girl of 11 years of age who has not gone to school for two months. Her mother does not want her to come for therapy, and the girl has expressed her objection to coming. However, as long as her father brings her I will attempt to work with her. In her case since she claims not to know why she can't get to school even though she wants to, her father wants her to, the school insists that she do and her mother wants her to

(even though her mother says she won't insist) because the last time she did, it made her daughter repeatedly sick to her stomach so she had to be sent home. I will attempt to work with her as long as her father can bring her. The most promising approach in working with the girl is to get her to verbalize her hatred and recognize her sabotaging behavior. At the same time it is necessary to get her father to modify his very strict moral attitudes. The mother, incidentally, has been hospitalized in the past and from the limited information available at this time, may have to be again.

My purpose in presenting both of these cases is to indicate that younger children can be worked with as well as adolescents or college students and, of course, adults.

I would like to point out that ours is a behaviorally oriented but not specifically symptom oriented therapy. We attempt to work with the variety of problems a human being has rather than merely removing his phobic responses or altering a particular deviant pattern. However, I do use relaxation, hypnosis (occasionally) and Wolpe's desensitization technique as well as any other method that I can think of when the occasion seems to warrant it. The therapeutic goal that I strive for is a self-actualized autonomous human being who is capable of asserting himself, who is capable of critically evaluating the world in which he lives, who has a

high degree of awareness of himself and becomes increasingly an actor rather than a reactor. I think my major objection to Behavioral Modification lies in this area. I do not cherish the idea of engineering situations or people so that they fit better, conform better, and adjust better to a basically irrational and absurd world. I prefer to give them the knowledge necessary to live in this world with relatively little emotional disturbance, with the statistically normal neurotic problems and with the capability of leading their own lives in an intelligent and self-satisfying way which at the same time dictates a certain amount of social concern and a desire to become creatively involved with life. Life can be a tragic comedy or an invitation to live! It is probably both!